REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are currently pending in the Application. Claims 14 and 15 have been indicated as allowable and this indication is deeply appreciated. Claims 1-13 stand rejected. This rejection is by way of a Final Office Action dated December 17, 2004.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b), 35 U.S.C. Section 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a):

Claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 (e) as being anticipated by Lehmann (U.S. Patent No. 6,164,248). Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmann and further in view of Inoue et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,377). Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmann. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 (b) as being anticipated by Kurr et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,529,026). Claim 7 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmann in view of Zajac et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,315,267). Claims 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lehmann in view of Inoue et al. and further in view of Zajac et al.

The principal references relied upon for the anticipation rejection are Lehmann and Kurr, et al. These rejections are traversed. It would appear that the Examiner misunderstands the scope of the non-allowed Claims as defined by the terminology in the Claims. The non-allowed Claims have thus been amended to more clearly distinguish between ports, openings and

passages. The non-allowed Claims now set forth that the valve control system includes a valve rotor with a first flow passage arrangement and a second flow passage arrangement and with at least four (4) openings associated with the passages in the valve rotor.

The two principal references, Lehmann and Kurr, et al., for the purposes of the present invention, are essentially the same structure. They have a valve body with a rotor with a single flow passage arrangement. By adjusting the angular position of the rotor, various different flow paths can be formed by the Lehmann structure. Kurr, et al. can make only one flow path and apparently can be used to regulate the flow rate or shut it off.

Inoue et al. is cited for disclosing a heater control valve that utilizes sensors and Zajac et al. is cited for disclosing a bypass valve with a biasing spring without providing the motivation or suggestion as why either Reference should be combined with Lehmann.

The Claims have now been amended to provide for a plurality of flow passage arrangements and at least three ports in the valve rotor itself. None of this is taught by any of the cited References of record. Thus, the rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 102(b) have been obviated.

In further support of patentability, the following comments are provided. Lehmann and Kurr, et al. and the other references of record all use a single flow passageway arrangement through the rotor. The present invention utilizes a plurality of flow passage arrangements, providing more flexibility wherein one can position hoses to attach to the inlets and outlets on the housing and can provide for more than two flow paths. Thus, the present invention provides

an advantage not available in any of the teachings of the cited References, i.e., the ability to better position the outlets at various angular orientations because of the use of the use of at least two flow passage arrangements. Thus, the outlets can be positioned at more circumferential positions around the valve housing than can be accomplished with Lehmann and Kurr, et al. In some of the depending claims, there is further detail of the invention, for example, the portions of the two internal fluid passage arrangements lie generally in planes that can be spaced apart along the longitudinal access of the valve rotor housing. It is also prescribed that the plurality of passage arrangements portions lie in generally parallel planes and have a third passage connecting the first and the second flow passage portions in fluid communication. Furthermore, by the use of two passage arrangements, more flexibility can be provided in flow path formation for the flow of coolant.

There is no suggestion or teaching in the references of record of the present invention. It is also submitted that a new search is not required, as the plurality of internal fluid passages was addressed in previously presented Claim 8.

It is now believed that Claims 1-13 in the present application, as currently amended, are allowable and allowance of the Claims is respectfully requested. New Claims 16-18 are added to describe the first fluid internal fluid passage and the second internal fluid passage being in separate planes. No new matter has been added. It is respectfully believed that Claims 16-18 are also allowable.

If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance the application such as an Examiner's Amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding this amendment, it is respectfully requested that Examiner please telephone Applicants' undersigned Attorney in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 17, 2005

Kevin M. Kercher
Reg. No. 33,408
Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP
720 Olive Street, 24th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
(314) 345-6000
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS